

Appln No. 09/832,319

Amdt date March 17, 2005

Reply to Office action of December 17, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-51 will be pending in this application upon entry of the above amendments. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, 12-13, 15-18, 20-26, 29-30, 32, 34-35, 37-38, 40-43, and 46-47 have been amended. Claims 49-51 have been added. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims, and drawings. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration, reexamination, and an early indication of allowance of the now pending claims 1-50 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended so that they are now directed to a "computer-implemented" method. The various steps of the method are also clarified as being executed "under control of the computer." Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 13-28, 30-45, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cascio et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091818). Claims 12, 29, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cascio in view of Walsh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,429). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 has been recited to recite "at least one behavior document defining a plurality of actions . . .; and under control of the computer, applying the plurality of actions defined in the selected behavior document to the incoming document." Cascio fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

Appln No. 09/832,319

Amdt date March 17, 2005

Reply to Office action of December 17, 2004

Cascio is directed to a extracting data from a data stream generated, for example, by a host terminal, using a rule-based approach. (See, Abstract). As explained in detail in paragraphs 0053-0060 of Cascio, the rules contain descriptions of data patterns that are to be extracted from the data stream. Nothing in Cascio teaches or suggests, however, that the disclosed rules constitute "at least one behavior document defining a plurality of actions" where the plurality of actions are applied to the incoming document as is required by amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 7, 18, 24, 35, and 41 include limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1, which make claim 1 allowable. Thus, claims 7, 18, 24, 35, and 41 are also in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 15 and 32, as amended, recite a "director containing instructions . . . including selecting a business process for the incoming document, the business process including a plurality of actions" and a "dispatcher containing instructions . . . including applying the plurality of actions to the incoming document and effectuating the business process." Cascio fails to teach or suggest the recited "director" and "dispatcher." Accordingly, claims 15 and 32 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-6, 8-14, 16-17, 19-23, 25-31, 33-34, 36-40, 42-45, and 47-48 are also in condition for allowance because they depend on an allowable base claim, and for the additional limitations contained therein.

Appln No. 09/832,319

Amdt date March 17, 2005

Reply to Office action of December 17, 2004

With respect to claims 2, 13, 19, 30, 36, and 47, these claims recite that the "personality document is a XML document; and the selected behavior document is a XML document." Although Cascio discloses that the output document is expressed in a markup language, neither the rules nor the rule components, are in XML.

With respect to claims 3-4, 6, 8-9, 12, 16-17, 20, 21, 23, 25-26, 29, 34, 37-38, 40, 42-43, and 46, these claims recite specific "actions" that are defined by the "behavior document." The rules or rule components disclosed in Cascio fail to define these specific actions.

Claims 49-51 are new in this application. Applicant submits that these claims are also in condition for allowance because the limitations recited therein are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. Claim 49 is also in condition for allowance because it depends on an allowable base claim.

In view of the above amendments and remarks that follow, reconsideration, reexamination, and an early indication of allowance of the now pending claims 1-51 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Josephine E. Chang
Reg. No. 46,083
626/795-9900

JEC/lal